

McCann, Amy

From: McCann, Amy
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2003 6:45 PM
To: 'Jeffrey_Cross@aporter.com'; McCann, Amy
Cc: Matthew_Seiden@aporter.com
Subject: RE: PM/Covance Project Agreements 10 &
DSS: Yes
Jeff:

Thanks for your comments. The PAs are back dated because the work has already started. I understand your point in 1(b) and will clarify the issue with WSA. Thanks for your help.

Amy

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeffrey_Cross@aporter.com [mailto:Jeffrey_Cross@aporter.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2003 12:12 PM
To: AmyArnold.McCann@us.pm.com
Cc: Matthew_Seiden@aporter.com
Subject: RE: PM/Covance Project Agreements 10 & 11

Amy, attached are our comments to the two new project agreements.

You'll see that we have a note in Section 1(b). My read of the sentence is that the designee of the recipient of results is what is "requested" by PM, not the timing of the delivery. If this is correct, we may want to clarify the wording. The bigger issue, then, would be the timing of results -- is the business comfortable receiving results from Covance whenever Covance completes them, or would they prefer a definite schedule.

Also, note that both PAs are back dated. It's not a major issue, we just wondering whether it was necessary to back date both of them.

PM3006440757

2/13/2003

McCann, Amy

From: Jeffrey_Cross@aporter.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2003 12:12 PM
To: AmyArnold.McCann@us.pm.com
Cc: Matthew_Seiden@aporter.com
Subject: RE: PM/Covance Project Agreements 10 &
DSS: ?

Amy, attached are our comments to the two new project agreements.

You'll see that we have a note in Section 1(b). My read of the sentence is that the designee of the recipient of results is what is "requested" by PM, not the timing of the delivery. If this is correct, we may want to clarify the wording. The bigger issue, then, would be the timing of results -- is the business comfortable receiving results from Covance whenever Covance completes them, or would they prefer a definite schedule.

Also, note that both PAs are back dated. It's not a major issue, we just wondering whether it was necessary to back date both of them.

PM3006440758

2/13/2003